

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated May 5, 2004. Claims 1-6 are currently pending. It is gratefully acknowledged that the Examiner has allowed Claims 5 and 6, and has found allowable subject matter in Claim 4.

In the Office Action, However, in the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Heidari* (U.S. 5,790,957) in view of *Hoffman* (U.S. 6,622,017 B1), and Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Heidari* in view of *Hoffman*, and further in view of *Weaver, Jr., et al.* (U.S. 5,956,637 B1).

The Examiner has also rejected Claims 1, 5, and 6, under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, specifically taking issue with the term “voice recognition”. The Examiner is again asserting that “voice recognition” should read “speech processing”. As indicated above, Claims 1, 5, and 6 have been amended as suggested by the Examiner. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be withdrawn.

In addition, the Examiner has objected to the title of the invention as not being descriptive. As indicated above, the title has been amended to further describe the subject matter of the present invention. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner’s objection to the title be withdrawn.

The Examiner has also made a number of objections in the specification. More specifically, the Examiner has taken issue with the term “voice recognition” and the phrase “can not”. As indicated above, the term has been “voice” to read “speech” on page 1, lines 26 and 28, page 2, line 3, page 3, line 7, page 6, line 22, page 7, line 24(2), and page 8, line 5. Additionally, the term “can not” was amended to read “cannot” in the previous response filed on February 10, 2004. Therefore

it is respectfully submitted that the objections to the specification be withdrawn.

As indicated above, the Examiner has rejected independent Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Heidari* in view of *Hoffman*. More specifically, the Examiner asserts that *Heidari* teaches all the recitations of Claim 1, except for including speech recognition as one of the supported voice operations, which the Examiner asserts is taught in *Hoffman*. However, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is incorrect.

More specifically, the present invention does not simply supplement a speech recognition function to a dual-mode mobile terminal. Rather, the present invention enables a dual-mode mobile terminal to perform a speech recognition function *in an analog mode*. That is, in a dual-mode mobile terminal, a voice function is not normally operated in an analog mode because information for operating a speaker dependent voice function is stored in packet format memory. Therefore, in order to achieve the above aspect of the present invention, the vocoder is switched into a packet mode such that a voice function may be operated during an analog mode.

Specifically, the vocoder is switched into a packet mode in order to compare a voice input in the analog mode with voice data stored in packet format compressed in the memory. In other words, the present invention is not simply directed to forced switching of an operating mode of a vocoder in analog or digital communication, but to operating a voice record, voice output, and speech recognition, regardless of the communication mode. Therefore, even if it were conceded that *Heidari* teaches dual-modes and *Hoffman* teaches a speech recognition function, as is asserted by the Examiner, it is respectfully submitted that neither of these references, either alone or in combination, solve a problem occurring in the prior art, as solved by the recitations of Claim 1 of the present application, in which a speech recognition function is performed *in an analog mode*. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 is patentably distinct from *Heidari* in view of *Hoffman*, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Claim 1 be withdrawn.

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims, namely, Claims 1-6, are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell  
Reg. No. 33,494  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

**DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP**  
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.  
Uniondale, New York 11553  
Tel: (516) 228-8484  
Fax: (516) 228-8516

PJF/DMO/